

HAWAIIAN GAZETTE

M. RAPEE,
DIRECTOR OF THE GOVERNMENT PRESS.
HONOLULU:
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2, 1870.
BY AUTHORITY.

PROCLAMATION.

WE, KAMEHAMEHA V, by the Grace of God, of the Hawaiian Islands, KING;
DO PROCLAIM,
That it is Our will and pleasure, in pursuance of the provisions of Our Constitution, that the Members of the Legislative Assembly of Our Kingdom, do assemble at the Court House, in Our City of Honolulu, for the despatch of Public Business, at 12 o'clock, M., on Saturday the thirtieth day of April, in the year of Our Lord, One Thousand Eight Hundred and Seventy. Given under Our Royal Sign Manual, at Iolani Palace, in Our City of Honolulu, this first day of March, A. D. One Thousand Eight Hundred and Seventy, and in the Seventh Year of Our Reign.
KAMEHAMEHA R.
By the KING,
The Minister of the Interior,
F. W. HUTCHISON.

Collector General's Office,
Honolulu, Feb. 23d, 1870.
JOHN A. HANSEN has this day been appointed Deputy Collector of Customs, for the Port and Collection District of Honolulu, Island of Oahu.
W. F. ALLEN,
Collector General of Customs.

THAT eminent critic of the *Advertiser* has several times done us the honor to attribute our modest efforts to place his position right before the public, to the Minister of Foreign Affairs. The pride which we might be expected to feel in this, is certainly somewhat chastened by the well-known fact, that his reason for thus attributing our writings to another, is for the purpose of adding one more attack to the hundreds he has already made against that Minister. He is like the boy conquered in a battle of fists, who exclaimed, "well, if I can't whip you, I'll make mouths at you, sir." So if he cannot beat us in an argument, or make good his assertions as facts, he can say something about the Minister—no matter how irrelevant it is—or whether in point of fact, the Minister was within five thousand miles, of the matter suggested against him. Some say that it is unwise for this paper to pay any attention to such attacks upon the members of the Government, or to similar attacks upon our most worthy and honorable citizens, in private life. We are sometimes told, that there is no use in defending the character of any man against the slanders of those who do not feel the least moral responsibility as journalists; who, when a man disagrees with them, immediately denounce him as a villain, and if rebuked for it, redouble their accusations and insinuations. We can not agree with this view of our duty to the public, in the position we now occupy. Nothing, in our view of the case, has done more to retard the progress of this country than the careless fault-finding and slanders of certain newspaper writers against the Government and the misrepresentation of the press, here, which boasts of its "independence";—that, and that alone, has engendered and kept alive dissatisfaction among some good people here, and so long as it remains unrebuked, just so long will its influence be damaging. With this idea, we intend, so far as we can, to rebuke it, and if its managers are quite unequal to the understanding of gentle language and polite reasoning, we expect to be obliged, in the future, as in the past, sometimes, to use very plain language; never intending, however, to descend to the scurrilous blackguardism to which they frequently do. Without ever attacking them, we shall, when the most respected members of our community are slandered and vilified by them, raise our voice in their defence, and when it shall seem necessary, we shall not let their misrepresentations of the policy of this Government, and the aims and objects of its members, pass without at once pointing them out; and we do not promise, always, to call them by so mild a term as "misrepresentation." We propose this course for ourselves, because we deem it our duty. Every person in this Kingdom is interested in having a stop put to the constant carping and misrepresentations of these people.

When we see them inclined to advocate their views—if they have any—in a gentlemanly manner, allowing those who disagree with them the privilege of doing so without abusing and blackguarding them, no one will rejoice more than we shall, because nothing can be more unpleasant than to feel obliged, constantly, to be engaged in a combat, particularly when there is but little hope of reforming those who are doing so much injury, and whose only study and aim is to stir up strife—where all one can hope to do is to set matters in a proper light before the public,—a portion of whom are always unconvinced, from the fact that some people prefer to believe that which is untrue to that which is true, when the truth reflects upon the character of a neighbor. In making the above statement, let us not be understood as counting censure, but simply as avowing our pur-

pose to defend what we consider is right when it is assailed; and the Editor of the *Advertiser* may attribute our articles to just whom he thinks proper; but inasmuch as he does not seem desirous of commending, in any respect, the person who now holds the Foreign Office, would it not be well for him to reflect, whether he is not doing himself injustice, by attributing to the Minister so much industry—for some people reckon industry a virtue, even though it may, in their opinion, be wrongly directed.

We publish on our outside, to-day, the charge of Judge Hoffman to the jury impaneled to try the case of the U. S. ex. 12,347 bags of sugar, imported into San Francisco by the steamer *Idaho*, in September 1868, and seized because 2,936 bags of it had been mixed with carbon, for the purpose of rendering it unmerchantable as grocery sugar, and reducing it below No. 12, Dutch Standard, in color, with the expectation that it would pass the Custom-House at San Francisco at the lowest rate of duties. It can not be claimed that the opinion of one Judge, on any matter, is infallible, however eminent that Judge may be, and however weighty his opinion may be in consequence of his position. No one is bound to waive his own opinions on account of a judicial dictum, however much it may be, as it certainly is, the duty of good citizens to bow to a conscientious decision, when rendered by a Court of last appeal. We publish this decision now,—though we have not thought it worth while to do so before—in hope that our fellow citizens will read it carefully, and that they will see there is no reason for sneering at one, and designating him as a person of "charcoal notoriety" because, before the decision was given, he may have ventured to express an opinion that the act was justifiable under the law of the United States, and defensible as a moral proposition. The defendants have taken their appeal to the Supreme Court at Washington, and it will probably be heard there. It certainly—most certainly—would have been so, had Mr. Gordon lived; and it may yet happen that those who build their ideas of moral fitness, as well as legal propriety, upon the views of others more eminent in position than themselves, may have occasion to regret their sneers, and to remark: "We have always thought that the act was defensible." It may, on the other hand, happen that the judgment will be confirmed, and that these worthy sycophants of power—provided that the power be exercised in another country than that which has the misfortune to shelter them at present—may have an opportunity of saying: "Behold how wise we were; we always knew so; we always said so."

Whenever immense duties are levied on any article, and more especially upon an article of prime necessity, there will always be an exercise of ingenuity to avoid the payment of such excessive duty. But this was not the case in the matter of these sugars. It was an attempt to reduce a grade of sugar that is known as "Grocery" grade, below that grade, to render it unfit for commerce, and bring it down to a "Refinery" grade, which the law favored to the amount of half a cent per pound. We do not intend to enter into any discussion about this matter—our readers and patrons may be sure of that. We have hitherto published some letters on the subject, and if requested, may do so again, whenever the subject may appear to interest our fellow citizens, or whenever we think it may be instructive or advantageous to their material interests. This was an action between the United States and one of their own citizens, who made no concealment, but came into Court, avowing and justifying the act—having entered into the enterprise under advice of most eminent counsel. But it may be well to say how it happened that the device of mixing carbon with the sugar was resorted to. It had been usual, before, to mix a light sugar with a darker one, to bring down the whole color below No. 12. This no one ever doubted to be perfectly legitimate; but it was found that the darker sugars, which generally were second or third crystals, melted (deliquescent, as it is termed) the lighter, or first crystals, so that there was a loss of weight. For this reason, it was thought necessary to resort to some other expedient, and inasmuch as it was believed that the color, (No. 12,) was put at a lower duty, simply for the purpose of protection to Refiners, Mr. Gordon did not believe that the admixture of charcoal—which could only be taken out by refining, and which reduced the sugar to refinery sugar—could be construed into any fraud on the revenues of the United States, more especially as he was not required to state the color in his invoices, but is always left to the judgment of the Appraisers. See charge of the Judge, as follows:

"It is argued, with the ingenuity which has characterized counsel throughout the whole case, that the suppression or concealment of any fact which the law does not call upon him to disclose is not wrongful, and that inasmuch as in this case it was not required that in the entry or the invoice the color of the goods should be stated, the suppression or concealment of the true color could not be an offense. It is true, gentlemen, that the color of the sugar is not required to be stated in the invoice."

Moreover, the mixing of carbon was very apparent, it not only not requiring astuteness to discover it, but the greatest stupidity not to discover it. There were only 2,936 bags out of the whole 12,347—being less than one-fourth of them, and all the bags containing the mixed sugars were marked with a particular mark. Mr. Gordon thought it would rest with the Appraisers to say, on this state of facts, whether or not the sugar was reduced, in fact, to what the statute regarded as No. 12; and if they decided adversely to his idea, and ordered him to pay 3/4 cents per pound, he could appeal to the Secretary

of the Treasury, and if he should support the Appraisers—so be it. As we have said before, the best of counsel, after mature reflection, in view of the protective nature of the Tariff, did not hesitate to advise him that this would be legal and right. Upon this point, the Judge remarks:

"Nor does the character of the device, whether simple or apparent, readily or with difficulty to be detected, provided it be fraudulent, affect the question. The degree of skill, ingenuity or cunning with which the fraud is contrived, can make no difference. Nor, gentlemen, is it true, as contended, that the forfeiture in such case is limited to the mere goods in relation to which such fraudulent practice is used."

And that seemed to be the whole point. It was denied, for the Refinery, that it was FRAUDULENT, or that there was any SKILL or CUNNING used in the matter; but they averred it was an honest attempt to bring the article within the grade admitted by the law at 3 cents per pound.

It will be seen that the learned Judge did not approach the case with so much nonchalance as some of our fellow citizens, for he remarks:

"The counsel for the claimants has presented instructions, thirty-six in number, with the request that I will give them to you as the law in the case. They may be true, or they may be false, but I do not go there as the Reporter of the enterprise, but as the Delegate of the Agent of the Mission Society."

It would be difficult to find out the falsehood in this, but we are confirmed by the *Advertiser* and *Koeko* in having attributed the narrative to Rev. Mr. Pogue, —not to Mr. Randolph—and that eminently respectable sheet the *Friend*, in publishing Mr. Pogue's report to the Society, makes use of the following expression: "Mr. Randolph, an English gentleman, who resides on the Island, and in whose house we found Mr. Mahoe, gave me the following account of the shooting;" a nearly exact copy of which was published in the *Gazette*. It will be seen that Mr. Pogue does not say anything about the *Advertiser*.

And further on, he says:

"It will strike you as curious that Government should affirm that a practice had been resorted to which is morally and legally fraudulent, and that this practice or contrivance should be admitted to have been used, and should be defined and justified on legal and, I believe, moral grounds. It is not often that counsel of distinguished ability and high character are so totally at variance upon moral as well as legal questions."

Thus, again, it appears that the "contrivance" was "admitted," and the Judge "believed" to be defended on "moral grounds," as well as legal. He avers that counsel of "distinguished ability and high character" are at "variance upon moral as well as legal questions," and he states, as a result of his experience, that such does not often happen; and referring to Mr. Gordon himself, he speaks of him as "a gentleman once deceased, well known for his public spirit, his great mental activity, and varied attainments."

Surely, one must have great confidence in his own legal and moral discernment, or a great want of modesty, who will venture, after a veteran Judge has thus spoken, from his judgment seat, to sneer at another gentleman to whom each of the qualities attributed by the Judge to Mr. Gordon will apply, to a by no means inconsiderable degree, as one of "charcoal notoriety," because he has taken a similar view.

Again, says the Judge:

"It may appear to some of you, gentlemen, that there has been but an innocent mistake as to the law, a mere inadvertence given to the statute; that for this mistake the confiscation of the goods is too severe a penalty. But you are not at liberty to be influenced by these considerations. Mr. Gordon's ignorance of, or mistake as to, the law, can not excuse him. He did this act at his peril, and if the act be an offense under the statute, the penalty of the law attaches."

Surely, that can not be an act to which an unenviable "notoriety," damaging to one's personal reputation, must attach, when the Judge uses such language regarding it, whilst delivering his charge to a jury; nor can the justification of it indicate a great want of moral perception, except in the eyes of those who are preternaturally wise and discreet, and whose wisdom is—as the lawyers say—*ex post facto*.

Our Neighbor—the *Advertiser*.

We beg pardon of our readers for again alluding to him—but he is really so very amusing, by reason of his absurdities, that he is quite astounded to see himself shown up. What must be the effect, therefore, upon other people? For ourselves, life would be a perfect blank unless we had the benefit of his lucubrations. In a "short reply to a long leader," among other things sufficiently absurd and amusing, he makes the following remark:

"In the whole case, the testimony of Nakook was set aside as unworthy of credence, by the Magistrate, though the Crown Attorney declared him to be 'a perfectly reliable witness,' and all the circumstances and testimony strongly corroborated it."

The testimony of Nakook was not "set aside" by any body, but simply weighed in the Magistrate's own mind, by the best lights at his disposal, which was the internal bearing of the evidence itself. We presume he means by "set aside as unworthy of credence," that the Magistrate did not place that reliance upon it which would have been gratifying to him—the Editor. No doubt that the Magistrate would have been very glad to gratify him; but he had his duty to do, and most undoubtedly gave all the testimony its due weight, and the public—whom we see and hear, and who are about all of them—fully concur with the Magistrate.

But what is most interesting, is that this defender of the public rights says that the Magistrate "set aside the evidence as unworthy of credence, though (1) the Crown Attorney (2) declared him to be a perfectly reliable witness;" and farther, under the head of "Snap Judgment in the Police Court," we have the following sentence:

"No prosecuting officer can be expected to do his duty, faithfully, when his best efforts are thus thwarted by one who ought to co-operate with him."

At that rate, it appears that the Magistrate is not to hold the scales balanced, and even to give the benefit of his reasonable doubts to the accused, but is to look upon himself as co-operating with the accuser—and in the case which he refers to as the "whalebone case," if Messrs. Stanley and Judd, who were attorneys for the defendant, argued, as they did, against

the credibility of this witness, the Magistrate is not to give his own judgment, but say, "Gentlemen, you see the Crown Attorney says he is a perfectly reliable witness, and the P. C. A. says I must take his word for it."

Touching his talk about Mr. Randolph, of Apia, having directed a communication to the *Advertiser*, we rather imagine that Mr. R. will be astonished at the amount of immortality which is being conferred upon him by the types of that parent of history over which our friend presides, which resembles Herodotus, in that "there are many fables contained therein." We simply took the liberty of imagining.

"That Mr. Randolph cares about as little for the P. C. A. as he does for the Patagonian who may be on the extreme end of Cape Horn; we further believe that if anybody directed anything to the *Commercial Advertiser*, it was that very worthy and estimable gentleman, the Editor's brother-in-law, and that he did not go there as the Reporter of the enterprise, but as the Delegate of the Agent of the Mission Society."

It would be difficult to find out the falsehood in this, but we are confirmed by the *Advertiser* and *Koeko* in having attributed the narrative to Rev. Mr. Pogue, —not to Mr. Randolph—and that eminently respectable sheet the *Friend*, in publishing Mr. Pogue's report to the Society, makes use of the following expression: "Mr. Randolph, an English gentleman, who resides on the Island, and in whose house we found Mr. Mahoe, gave me the following account of the shooting;" a nearly exact copy of which was published in the *Gazette*. It will be seen that Mr. Pogue does not say anything about the *Advertiser*.

To the question regarding the case of the young man on the Kaneohe Plantation:

"Regarding the case of the young man on the Kaneohe Plantation—we ask the same Minister to state distinctly and without prevarication, if a person employed on that plantation was not discharged for voting for Mr. Cummings, and in a few days thereafter re-instated?"

In his first allusion, he did not mention the Kaneohe Plantation, and no one could imagine to whom the man alluded; but as he seems to think that it is of great public importance, and requires an answer "without prevarication," perhaps the following note will appear sufficiently direct and conclusive:

Kaneohe, Feb. 28, 1870.
MR. EDITOR:—The statement in the *P. C. Advertiser* about one of the Laborers on Kaneohe Plantation being dismissed on account of voting for Mr. John Cummings on the last Election and re-instated after a few days—is a fabrication on the part of some one, as there has been no one discharged on this place during this year, for any cause whatever, either by Mr. C. C. Harris, his agent, or myself. As I am the Manager of the Laboring Department of the Kaneohe Plantation, Mr. Harris or my agent have never interfered with the Laborers under my charge, nor has Mr. Harris himself, had any communication with me in regard to Business or any other matter concerning the Plantation, during this year.
Yours Respectfully,
M. ROSE.

Book Notices.

Reviews of Cases determined in the Supreme Court of the State of California, at the October Term, 1868, and January Term, 1869. J. E. HALE, Reporter. Vol. 36. SUMNER, WITKIE, Publisher.

By the favor of the Secretary of the State of California, and the attention of our Counsel, Mr. Severance, our Government Law Library has been furnished with the last four volumes of the Supreme Court Reports of that State. The student of law is prone to look in despair, and the rest of the world in wonder or contempt, at the vast accumulation of law books. The shades of Coke, Bracton, and Glanville are usually approached, if at all, through a dense mass of text books, digests and reports. The true investigator would find follow the maxim, "*Melius est perire fontes quam sectari rivulos*;" but we fear there are but few who share with Chancellor Kent in his regret at the passage of the New York law concerning an estate for life, remainder to tenant's heirs. Here it is: "The juridical scholar, on whom his great master, Coke, has bestowed some portion of the 'gladsome light of jurisprudence,' will scarcely be able to withhold an involuntary sigh, as he casts a retrospective glance upon the piles of learning devoted to destruction by an edict as sweeping and unrelenting as the torch of Omar. He must bid adieu forever to the renowned discussions in Shelley's case, which were so vehement and protracted as to rouse the sceptre of the haughty Elizabeth. He may equally take leave of the multiplied specimens of profound logic, skillful criticism and refined distinctions which permeate the varied cases in law and equity from those of Shelly and Archer, down to the direct collision between the courts of law and equity, in the time of Lord Hardwicke. He will have no more concern with the powerful and animated discussions in Perin vs. Blake, which awakened all that was noble and illustrious in talent and endowment, through every precinct of Westminster Hall!" We once entertained a hope that some day we might feel like joining our sympathetic tear in the lament of the worthy Chancellor, but we prefer not to chronicle our success.

Those brought up on the "strong meat of the common law," may absorb much of the good, and reject much of the bad, in the law as it progresses, by the aid of a fair amount of industry and sense; but no one is safe in presuming that he knows the law, or knows what the law ought to be, if he neglects the decisions of the Courts, upon the new complications of questions as they arise. We, in these Islands, are particularly concerned in the decisions of the highest tribunals of a State, the mercantile law of which must so sensibly affect our own interests.

We note the following decisions in the present volume: In A. T. Stewart vs. Levy, the defendant had bought goods of the plaintiff, with intent to defraud. On judgment for the amount of the claim, it was held that the laws of California allow imprisonment for debt, on a *ca. sa.*, in such a case.

In Wright vs. Ryder, the California Steam Navigation Company had sold the steamer *New World* to the Oregon Company, the latter Company binding itself in the sum of \$75,000, not to run the steamer on California waters for ten years. The steamer was subsequently sold twice, the defendant being the last purchaser. The Court held that the contract was void as in restraint of trade, but voided the question whether such covenants run with the ship. Admitting, of course, that the owners might let the vessel rot at the wharf, he can not say the Court, make a binding contract with another to do so, he might afterwards change his mind, and desire to en-

gage in commerce with her. The case attempts no distinction between contracts not to exercise personal skill, and not to use specified property for specified purposes.

In Wilson vs. Wilson, the wife sued her husband for money due upon a note executed to her by the husband before marriage. Advocates of women's rights will be interested to see that the wife recovered judgment. Who paid the wife's lawyer, or who tended house while the married pair indulged in their legal diversion, does not appear. Nor is it clear that this paying from one pocket into another, as both pockets were the husband's, would be of any use to the wife.

In Briggs vs. McCulloch, the law was considered which exempts life insurance policies from execution for debt. The power of debtors thus to place their money beyond the reach of creditors, seems to be admitted.

In Wheaton vs. N. B. and M. R. R. Co., the following instruction to the jury was refused: "The rule that passenger carriers are to be held to the strictest diligence, is not to be understood by the jury as requiring of such carriers those particular precautions, as it is apparent that the accident might have prevented the injury." The refusal was held correct, as "the duldest comprehension would not be misled." It is but lately that English Courts have decided that passenger carriers are not insurers against accident, but are held to the highest care possible upon antecedent knowledge.

In People vs. Washington, the Civil Rights Bill is held to be constitutional, giving all persons born in the United States, not foreign subjects, "full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of person and property as is enjoyed by white citizens;" and the State law is held to be void, which provides that no Indian, Mongolian, or Chinese, shall give evidence in favor of or against a white person. Justice Crockett gives a dissenting opinion for himself and Justice Sprague, on the grounds that the case did not come within the Act of Congress, and if it did, the Act itself was unconstitutional. The Judge thinks if Congress can forbid a State from making such distinction by reason of race or color, no State will have power to prohibit marriage between the races, the holding of property by foreigners, or the exercise of suffrage by women; no State can enact laws for the observance of Sunday by Chinese, for separate schools for white and colored children, or for health and police regulations.

The Court has just lost two strong men, in Justices Sawyer and Sanderson, the former of whom has been appointed upon the U. S. Circuit, and the latter has returned to practice.

MERCHANDISE, & C.

Superior Quality of Articles!
AT LOW PRICES,
—AND—
Reasonable Terms
FOR SALE AT THE STORE OF
THEOD. C. HEUCK.

AMERICAN, ENGLISH & FRENCH
Prints, new styles, colors and patterns.

FOR FAMILY USE,
Superior Sheetings, Cottons, Linens and Woollens.

BLEACHED AND UNBLEACHED
Moleskins, Black and Blue Broadcloth, 35 in. wide.

WOOL BLANKETS, large & heavy,
in white, blue, red, green, orange, etc.

BLACK & COLORED COBURGS,
Alpacas, Merinos, Barathas, Lasting, etc.

BUNTING—White, Blue, Red, Green
Yellow and Black.

MEN'S SHIRTS, UNDERSHIRTS
and Drawers, in cotton, linen, wool and silk, of large variety.

LINEN HANDKERCHIEFS,
Kid Gloves for Ladies and Gentlemen. Also, Towels, Suspenders and Neckties.

MEN'S SUPERIOR CLOTHING,
in cotton, half-linen, linen, half-wool and wool.

HOSIERY—A Large Assortment of
Men's and Women's Socks and Stockings.

FELT HATS—different qualities and
new styles.

SHOES AND GAITERS,
of very superior quality, for Gentlemen, Ladies and Children.

SUPERIOR SADDLES,
for Ladies and Gentlemen. Also, Bridles, Spurs and Whips.

WHITE AND BLUE FLANNEL,
and White Cotton Flannel.

BURLAPS—Wide, and of Strong
quality, suitable for bags or bales for coffee, wool and rice.

INDIA RUBBER DOOR MATS,
also mats for carriages of same material.

WRAPPING PAPER,
for Grocery and Hardware purposes.

SUPERIOR CUTLERY,
such as Butcher and Sailor Knives, Pocket Knives and Scissors. Also, Patent Corkscrews, Needles Nos. 1 to 16, Fish Hooks, Jewelpicks, etc.

PAINTS AND OILS,
of very superior quality, such as White Lead, Zinc White, Linseed Oil, etc.

SHEET LEAD & SHEET ZINC,
of different weights and sizes.

FRESH GROCERIES,
Sardines in quarter and half boxes,
Half Barrels Crushed Sugar, Dried Apples,
Swiss Cheese, Almonds, Serrano,
Pearl barley, Sugar, Chocolate,
Cocoa-powder, Anchovies,
Bologna Sausages, &c.

BEER—Deetjen & Schroder's Best
Hamburg Ale, in quarts.

WINES—Genuine German Rhine-
Wines, viz.—Geisenheimer, Leibfräulein, etc., in
pints and quarts.

SPIRITS—Superior Port Wine,
Brandy, Sherry, Superior Cognac in casks,
Scotch, Irish and Bourbon Whiskey,
Holland Gin, in casks and cases,
German and Dutch Brandy,
California Wine Bitters,
Malt Extract of Beer,
Korn Brandwein.

SPARKLING HOCK and Champagne,
of very superior quality, in pints and quarts, worthy
of being especially recommended.

BEST FINE DAIRY SALT.
Also, Salt-water Soap, Balls of White Soap,
Candles, in 4, 5 and 6 packages,
Mosses Oil, Envelopes, Playing Cards,
Copying Presses, Books, etc.

WALL PAPER & BORDERING,
Gilt Cornering, etc., a superior assortment just
opened, and for sale cheap.

WATER COOLERS,
of strong and porous material.

GILT FRAME MIRRORS,
of different sizes and patterns of frame.

Please Call and Examine.
COUNTRY ORDERS SOLICITED
WHICH WILL MEET WITH
PROMPT ATTENDANCE!

ISLAND PRODUCE RECEIVED
IN EXCHANGE FOR WHICH,
The Highest Possible Price will be Paid!

Purchasers will find it to their interest to call
at the store of
THEOD. C. HEUCK.
Honolulu, Feb. 22, 1870.—34

Licences Expiring in March, 1870.

RETAIL, OAHU—Honolulu: 14th, S. M. Carter, Fort.
1st, 19th, Mrs. Singer, Maunaloa; 24th, Grunwald
A. Schlegel, Maunaloa; 14th, J. Richardson, Fort.
24th, Fischer & Roth, Fort.; 10th, Fuchsberg, Fort.
1st, 10th, Linn Tal, Beresford; 6th, J. Perry, Nu-
uanu; 1st, A. M. M. King, 30th, Brewer &
Co., Queen St.; 19th, P. S. Chan, Nuuanu; 15th, G.
W. Norton, Eopelanae; Waianae: 12th, Ashong;
Salo: 17th, O. Schuler, Kaula; 27th, Nawa &
R. Beck, MAUI—Maunaloa: 1st, Kobi, Maunaloa;
1st, Lualoa, Waialeale; 16th, W. K. Kono, HAWAII,
S. Kono: 22d, I. Correa, Waialeale; 24th, Chang
Hoon, Kaula; 24, G. W. Jones, Orono; 24,
Aha & Co. Hilo; 8th, Akai; 12th, Akima, KAUAI
—Hawaii: 21st, Ah Tson & Oloka, Koloa; 1st,
Fukushima; 10th, Ah Mear, Kailua; 1st, E. Krali,
Lihue; 7th, Plantation; 12th, Paeschen.

WHOLESALE—Honolulu: 15th, Chuan Bros.,
Kono; 24th, Brewer & Co., Queen St.
WHOLESALE SPIRITS—Honolulu: 13th, M. C.
Chambers, Nuuanu St.

PUBLIC SHOW—Honolulu: 6th, Eng. Comp'y
No. 2.
BUTCHER—Honolulu: 6th, E. Ridley.
HORSE—Honolulu: 16th, Kelly, No. 161; 16th,
Nak. Eschbacher, No. 122; 24th, Raju, No. 122.
BOAT—Honolulu: 11th, G. Tyler, No. 32. HA-
WAI—Hilo: 14th, I. Upe; 4th, Napeahi.
AUGUST, HAWAII—J. H. Conroy, 14th,
VICTUALING—Lahaina: 11th, Kapukaia.
VICTUALING OFFICE, 1st March, 1870.

LEGAL NOTICES.

Supreme Court—In Probate.
In the matter of the Estate of J. R. Hartwell, of Honolulu, deceased. Before Hon. A. S. Hartwell, Judge of the Court.
ON READING AND FILING THE Petition of W. C. Parke, Administrator of the Estate of James Currie, deceased, for the final settlement of the account of his administration, and for his discharge from further responsibility on the premises.
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT FRIDAY the FOURTH DAY OF MARCH at 10 o'clock A. M., be the day and hour for hearing said application and all objections thereto, at the Court House in Honolulu, and that due notice of the same be given by publication in the HAWAIIAN GAZETTE and *As Oloka*, (news-papers published at this city) for two consecutive weeks.
WALTER R. SEAL,
Deputy Clerk, Supreme Court.
Dated at Honolulu, Feb. 16, 1870. (6-2.)

Supreme Court—In Probate.
In the matter of the Estate of Frank Molteni, of Honolulu, deceased. Before Hon. A. S. Hartwell, Judge of the Court.
ON READING AND FILING THE Petition of Stephen H. Palmer, Administrator of the Estate of Frank Molteni, deceased, for the final settlement of the account of his administration, and for his discharge from further responsibility on the premises.
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT MONDAY the SEVENTH DAY OF MARCH, A. D., 1870 at 10 o'clock A. M., at the Court House in Honolulu, be the day and hour for hearing said application and all objections thereto. Notice thereof being given by publication for two consecutive weeks in the HAWAIIAN GAZETTE and *As Oloka*.
WALTER R. SEAL,
Deputy Clerk, Supreme Court.
Dated at Honolulu, Feb. 16, 1870. (6-2.)

Circuit Court—In Probate.
In the matter of the Estate of Charles F. Newman, of Koloa, Kaula, late deceased.
PROPER APPLICATION having been made to the undersigned by D. E. Tyne and Mary Ann Newman, Administrators of the Estate of Charles F. Newman, late of Koloa, Kaula, for an examination of their accounts and discharge from further responsibility on the premises, notice is hereby given to all concerned, that WEDNESDAY the 15th DAY OF MARCH, at 10 o'clock A. M., will be heard this application, and all objections thereto at the Court House, WAHIAWA, KAUAI.
DUNCAN McBRIDE,
Circuit Judge, 4th Judicial Ct.
Wahiawa, Feb. 9, 1870. (6-)

Circuit Court—In Probate.
In the matter of the Estate of Thomas H. Marshall, of Lihue, Kaula, late deceased.
PROPER APPLICATION having been made to the undersigned by D. E. Tyne and John Stuppleson, Administrators upon the Estate of Thomas H. Marshall, late of Lihue, Kaula, for an examination of their accounts and discharge from further responsibility on the premises, notice is hereby given to all concerned, that THURSDAY the 17th DAY OF MARCH, at 10 o'clock A. M., will be heard this application, and all objections thereto at the Court House, NEWBURN, KAUAI.
DUNCAN McBRIDE,
Circuit Judge, 4th Judicial Ct.
Wahiawa, Feb. 9, 1870. (6-)

Circuit Court—Maui.
At Chambers, Lahaina, Maui, Feb. 26th 1870. Hon. A. S. Hartwell, Judge of the Supreme Court.
ON READING AND FILING the petition of O. Keano Kipp, praying for a divorce from her husband James Kipp, on the ground of his willful and continued desertion of her for three successive years. IT WAS ORDERED that the said James Kipp, do appear and answer to the said petition on or before the first day of next June Term of the Circuit Court at Lahaina, before the presiding Justice at Chambers, and that thereon being given by previous publication in the HAWAIIAN GAZETTE, for three successive weeks.
3-5m THOMAS SHEEL, Clerk.

PACKET LINES.

HAWAIIAN PACKET LINE.
FOR SAN FRANCISCO.
The Favorite Clipper Ship
D. C. MURRAY,
Master.
N. T. BENNETT, Agent.
Will follow the ETHER ALLEN in the line.
For freight or passage, having superior accommodations for cabin and stowage passengers, apply to
WALKER & ALLEN, Agents.
2
The North Pacific Transportation Company's
SAN FRANCISCO & HONOLULU LINE.

The Company's Splendid A. H. Steamship
IDAHO,
R. S. FLOYD, Commander.
WILL RUN REGULARLY.
Between Honolulu & San Francisco
LEAVE ARRIVE LEAVE ARRIVE
SAN FRANCISCO, AT HONOLULU, HONOLULU, AT SAN FRANCISCO
Sat. Feb. 20. Sat. Mar. 5. Sat. Mar. 12. Sat. Mar. 19.
Sat. Apr. 2. Thurs. Apr. 14. Wed. Apr. 20. Thurs. May 3.
Sat. May 10. Sat. May 22. Fri. May 27. Thurs. Jun. 3.
Wed. June 10. Sat. June 25. Sat. July 2. Sat. July 9.

Liberal Advances Made on all Ships
men and per Steamer.
Freight for San Francisco will be received at the Steamer